

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in reply to the final Office Action mailed on April 24, 2009. No fees are due herewith this Amendment. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 02-1818. If such a withdrawal is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. 115808-481 on the account statement.

Claims 1-49 are pending. Claims 14, 20, 38 and 41 were previously canceled. In the Office Action, Claims 19, 23, 24 and 34 are objected to and Claims 1-13, 15-18, 21-22, 25-33, 35-37, 39-40 and 42-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. In response, Applicants have canceled Claims 1-13, 15-19, 21-37, 39-40 and 42-49 and added new Claims 50-82. The amendments do not add new matter. In view of the amendments and for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections should be withdrawn and that new Claims 50-82 should be allowed. Moreover, Applicants request that the amendments be entered as they place the patent application in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, Claims 19, 23, 24 and 34 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. However, the Examiner states that these objected claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In view of Examiner's statement, Applicants have added new Claims 50-82, which should be allowable as new Claims 50, 72 and 74 are canceled Claims 19, 23 and 34 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Moreover, new Claim 73 depends from new Claim 72 exactly as canceled Claim 24 depended from canceled Claim 23. Further, new Claims 51-71 depend from allowable new Claim 50 and new Claims 75-82 depend from allowable new Claim 74. Accordingly, Applicants submit that new Claims 50-82 are allowable.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-13, 15-18, 21-22, 25-33 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,92,504 to Poppel et al. ("*Poppel*"), U.S. Publication No. 2004/0037943 to Saylock et al. ("*Saylock*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,379,738 to Dingman et al. ("*Dingman*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,454,804 to McCulloch ("*McCulloch*") and U.S. Patent No. 4,781,939 to Martin et al. ("*Martin*"). Claims 39-40 and 42-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Poppel*, *Saylock*, *Dingman* in view of *McCulloch* and U.S. Patent No. 4,011,346 to Ernst ("*Ernst*"). However, in view of the

cancellation of Claims 1-13, 15-19, 21-37, 39-40 and 42-49, Applicants submit that these obviousness rejections should be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified patent application and earnestly solicit an early allowance of same. In the event there remains any impediment to allowance of the claims that could be clarified in a telephonic interview, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to initiate such an interview with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

K & L GATES LLP

BY 

Robert M. Barrett
Reg. No. 30,142
Customer No.: 29157
Phone No. 312-807-4204

Dated: July 14, 2009